DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 474 463 FL 027 598

AUTHOR	Bravo Cladera, Nadezhda
TITLE	A Study of Discourse Markers and Their Distribution in Dyadic Interactions of Bilingual Youth.
PUB DATE	2002-00-00
NOTE	16p.; Paper presented at the Annual Nordic Conference on Bilingualism (8th, Stockholm, Sweden, November 1-3, 2001).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adolescents; *Bilingual Students; *Discourse Analysis; Foreign Countries; Hispanic Americans; Secondary Education; *Spanish
IDENTIFIERS	Chile; Sweden

ABSTRACT

This study examined discourse markers (DM) in Spanish that distinguished themselves by their frequency of use in dyadic interaction among young bilingual speakers in Sweden. It also established the distribution of DM in conversation. The DM were classified as initial markers (IM), corpus markers (CM), and terminal markers (TM). The study involved 262 minutes of spontaneous conversations in the basic corpus, plus 105 minutes in the control corpus (made up of young Chileans in Santiago de Chile). These Spanish speakers all had parents of Chilean or Hispanic American origin and spoke Spanish at home with their families (and with their friends if necessary). Recordings of spontaneous conversations occurred in participants' high schools, homes, and Hispanic American cultural centers. Results indicated that connectors were used more frequently than conversational markers. The most frequently used connectors were y, pero, porque, entonces, and asi que. The most frequently used conversational markers were um, bueno, no se, ya, and si. The DM were located at the turn of talk, first as CM, next as IM, and finally as TM. The most frequently used DM as CM were y, pero, and porque; as IM were um, y, and pero; and as TM um, pero, and y. (Contains 45 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Uppsala Universitet

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Nadezhda Bravo Cladera
Uppsala University
Department of Romance Languages

ED 474 463

A STUDY OF DISCOURSE MARKERS AND THEIR DISTRIBUTION IN DYADIC INTERACTIONS OF BILINGUAL YOUTH[1]

1 Introduction

The purpose of the study is, on the one hand to establish what are the *discourse markers* (DM) in Spanish that distinguish themselves by their frequency of use in dyadic interaction among young bilingual speakers in Stockholm, and on the other (hand), to establish their distribution in dialogues. Here we present a part of the results of our investigation.

2 Hypothesis

The study is based on the assumption that there is a preference for certain DM. Therefore, the DM are identified that qualify by their frequency of use among the informants, which means that we select those most frequently used in the *corpus*. A second step will be to ascertain where the DM are located in the conversations. The study has to deal with the distribution of the DM and in doing so it must characterise the elements used in analysing the dialogue: *turns at talk*, *utterances* and *idea units*. Assuming that the DM are preferably located in the middle of the turn of talk, that is to say that they are neither initial nor final their distribution is checked and they are classified as *Initial Markers* (IM), *Corpus Markers* (CM) and *Terminal Markers* (TM).

3 Material and Method

The body of information contains 262 minutes of spontaneous conversations in the basic *corpus* (BC),[2] plus 105 minutes in the control *corpus* (CC) [3] made by young Chileans, which will be taken into account later on. The BC and the CC together make up part of a general *corpus* (GC) that includes all the collected material. The BC was collected in Stockholm between 1997 and 1999 and the CC in Santiago de Chile in August 1999.

---

[1] This article is based in the Spanish version (Bravo Cladera, 2001).

[2] The BC is part of our project called Spanish of Bilingual Youth in Stockholm (Español de jóvenes bilingües en Estocolmo: EJBE). The materials for this study have been extracted from a *corpus* of 480 minutes of conversations of Spanish speaking youth. Our project is also part of another project that investigates the language and identity of Spanish speakers in Sweden: SPISS [Språk och identitetsutveckling i Sverige]). See Fant and Hyltenstam *et al* .(1999) for information on the project.

[3] The CC is named Spanish of Youth in Chile (Español de jóvenes en Chile: EJOCHI).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Dialogue/ informants	Number of Words
(1) Verónica, Carlos: **VC**	3 411
(4) Alcira, Natalia : **AN**	2 017
(5) Julio, Ivo: **JI**	1 894
(7) Pilar, Cecilia: **PC**	1 530
(10) Victoria, Ernesto: **VE**	2 457
(14) Miriam, Helena: **ME**	2 447
(15) Mario, Ramiro: **MR**	2 604
(16) María, Gabriel: **MG**	4 839
(17) César, Lino: **CL**	5 898
(18) Mercedes, Juana: **MJ**	3 622
(19) Lucio, Benito: **LB**	4 803
(20) Benito, Cecilia: **BC**	2 486
(21) Gina, Ramón: **GR**	2 724
Total number of words	**40 732**

Table 1. The informants and number of words in the dialogues

The first column of Table 1 lists the number of the magnetic tape,[4] and the names of the informants with their respective initials, which are at the same time the initials of the dialogue. In this way, we have tape (1), dialogue between Verónica and Carlos, that is to say dialogue VC. To get an overall view of the speech of the conversations, I have counted the number of graphic words. In the second column you will find the total numbers of words of every dialogue and the total number of words in the corpus. There is a total of 40 732[5] words.

Certain elements characterise the homogeneity of the Spanish speakers who make up the group of informants:[6]

- the number of years they have been living in Sweden.
- They all have parents of Chilean origin except in two cases in which one of the parents is from another Hispano-American country.
- The young informants speak Spanish at home with their parents and also with their friends if necessary.

There are 24 individuals, (Table 1), 13 females and 11 males. Age varies from 16 to 22 years.

The recordings of spontaneous conversations in the present study have been carried out in various settings, mostly in sixth-form grammar schools (senior high schools) but also in Hispano-American cultural centres and in the homes of the informants. In order to bring about con-

[4] We follow the original numeration of the magnetic tapes. This numeration corresponds to the chronological order in which they have been recorded. The number of the magnetic tapes that are missing belongs to another constellation of informants.

[5] In this number are included the initials of the informants, word repetitions and other words that include the automatical adding of the computer.

[6] The informants in the study belong to the Spanish American colony in Sweden. The Spanish American from South America in Sweden are almost 45 950 individuals (SIV: 1997). In this group there are near 17 000 youth between 16 and 22 years old.

versations, the young informants had to know each other, for example, be classmates, friends or family members. As far as I could see, the conversations were carried out in a co-operative way. Once the informants had started to talk, they developed a harmonious conversation touching on various topics concerning their studies, their spare time and other themes that might interest them. The young informants fully understood the reason for their participation and were in full agreement with the activities and the conversations were carried out in a natural way. The researcher was not present when the recordings were made because it was thought that her presence might hamper the spontaneousness of the informants. Labov (1972a: XVII) has formulated the paradox of the observer in relation to the problem of recording natural speech in society: "To obtain data on the most systematic form of language [...] we must observe how people speak when they are not being observed".

In order to verify the transcriptions, these have been read by one of the participants or by Chilean colleagues.

Contact with young Hispano-Americans has made me choose the spoken language as my area of investigation. It is more often used when speaking to parents, other family members, friends and among themselves. Likewise, my previous studies (Bravo Cladera, 1995; 1997; 1999 a, c) have proved a preferential use of spoken Spanish among bilingual children and youngsters in Sweden. I have preferred to study the informal variety of young people's speech as I suppose it to be the most commonly used.

First, I will characterise the elements of analysis of the dialogue and give examples from fragments of the dialogue. I will discuss the characteristics and the classification of the DM. Then I will give the frequency of use of the DM and their distribution in *turns of talk*. Lastly I will have a short discussion before the conclusions.

4 Elements of analysis of dialogue

The study consider conversation to be a social as well as a discursive interaction, that is, when two people start to talk, they interact socially through discourse, that is to say by using language (cf. Schiffrin, 1994).

The proposal to the study of dialogue made by the Swedish researcher Linell (1998) pretends to be essentially dialogic. His analysis of initiatives and answers in dialogues is inspired by the ideas of Baktin and others. Linell finds support in his assumption that the utterance in itself, carries features of initiatives and answers. Every dialogical contribution (that is *turns at talk*) is defined thanks to its request for an answer, that is, they are defined in relation to their

previous contributions in the discourse, and with their acts of initiative, that is, they take the anticipated context into consideration and also consider how to meet the continuing discourse.

4.1 Turns at talk

According to Linell (1998: chapter 9) *turns at talk*, *utterances* and *units of meaning* are basic contributions to the analysis of discourse. The *turn of talk* is characterised as a continuous period when the speaker holds the floor and his dialogical contributions comprise verbal as well as non verbal actions directly connected to that very moment. These contributions are part of the discourse jointly produced or taken as significant contributions at the turn of talk.

Linell (*op.cit:* 159) justifies the *turn of talk* as the basic unit of dialogical contribution: "apart from injecting content into the jointly produced discourse, it serves to regulate (and is regulated by) the current speaker's moment-to-.moment discursive and social relations to her interlocutor(s) and her (their) contributions". It is important to underline in accordance with Briz (1998: 54) that the informative transmissions that constitute the turn at talk should be: "recognised by the interlocutors by means of their evident and simultaneous attention."[7] According to Fant (1996: 150) the turn at talk: "is the unit that makes conversations advance within a frame",[8] and the *interventions* are: "coherent connected utterances emitted by a speaker".[9] A conversation is organised on: "the alternation of turns (at talk) through a succession of interventions made by different speakers."[10] (Tusón Valls, 1997: 55).

I will rely on the criteria of Linell and the definitions of Briz and Fant concerning the turn at talk.

4.2 Utterance

It seems there is lack of agreement among scholars regarding how to define the *utterance*. This expression has been termed differently (Linell, 1998: 160) as minimal unit of the analysis of dialogues, the *turn constructional unit* (Sacks *et al.*, 1974), the *unit of information* (Halliday, 1967), the *idea unit* (Soskin and John, 1963; Chafe, 1980) and so on. An *utterance* according to Levinson (1983: 18) is: "the issuance of a sentence, a sentence- analogue, or sentence-fragment, in actual context". In other words (Reyes 1995: 13): "the utterance is a communicative unit that equals the intervention of a speaker in a conversation [...] it is usual to say in order to simplify

---

[7] My translation (MT) from Spanish: " reconocidas por los interlocutores mediante su atención manifiesta y simultanea."
[8] MT from Spanish: " es la unidad que hace que la conversación progrese dentro de un orden ".
[9] MT from Spanish: " enunciados coherentes seguidos y emitidos por un hablante".
[10] MT from Spanish: "a partir de la alternancia de turnos, es decir a través de la sucesión de intervenciones a cargo de diferentes hablantes."

that the utterances are sentences put into use, that is into a context."[11] Linell (*ibid.*) explains that although the term *utterance* is rather vague and ambiguous, it is used in contrast to the description given above, "for roughly any stretch of continuous talk by one person, regardless of length and structure, whether outside of turns (as listener support items, [...]), or only part of a turn or in itself a whole turn." I will use this last characterisation of the utterance with a broader sense that will permit me to move with greater freedom within my analyses.

4.3 Idea unit

The *idea units* (Linell, 1998: 161) are segments of speech[12] used argumentatively in order to plan the discourse of speakers; and they are frequently delivered as coherent prosodic units.[13] These units play an important role as points of transition both for the speaker and for the listener. The speaker decides if he wants to go on talking or if he prefers to stop, and if he wants to go on, he will have to choose the topic and the listener will use the point of transition to decide on an answer. In this way, the segments of discourse are interpreted as soon as they are received and often an answer is given at the same point of contact, for example through *backchannelling*.[14]

4.4 The application of the elements of analysis

Here I will present example number (1) from my *corpus*. Alcira and Natalia are talking about their plans for the future after the baccalaureate:

---

[11] MT from Spanish, "el enunciado es una unidad comunicativa que equivale a la intervención de un hablante en una conversación [...] se suele decir, para simplificar, que los enunciados son oraciones puestas en uso, es decir puestas en contexto."

[12] The idea units described by Linell (1998) can be compared with the "macrosyntagm" av Loman and Jörgenssen (1971). A. Berrendonner, in personal communication on May 25, 2000, told me that the "macrosyntagm" is a syntactic unit for analysis of speech.

[13] Sinclair and Coulthard (1992 in Linell 1998: 160) "[...] have argued that similar units also correspond to elementary (speech) acts or 'moves' in conversation."

[14] See the characterisation in 4.4.

Example (1)

Line	Sender/Number turn at talk	Turn at talk
14.	Alcira (1):	*-cuando termines el colegio qué vas a hacer?* [15] -what are you going to do when you finish school?
15.	Natalia (1):	*-la verdad que no sé /pensaba viajar / con mis amigas alguna parte, pero no está seguro. porque parece que tengo un trabajo.* -the thing is I don't know, / thought of going / with my friends somewhere, but I am not sure, seems I've got a job.
16.	Alcira (2):	*-con tus amigas no más, con tu hermana también.* -only with your friends, with your sister as well.
17.	Natalia (2):	*-con mi hermana también / a lo mejor a Italia.* -with my sister as well / possibly to Italy.
18.	Alcira (3):	*-ujum. por mucho tiempo?* -uhum, for a long time?
19.	Natalia (3):	*no, doh semanas algo así (A: ah) yyy,* no, two weeks or something like that, (A: ah) and,
20.	Alcira (4):	*-a Italia no más?* -only till Italy ?
21.	Natalia (4):	*-sí.* -yes.
22.	Alcira (5):	*-sí?* -yes?
23.	Natalia (5):	*-a lo mejor.* -perhaps.
24.	Alcira (6):	*-'okey'*
25.	Natalia (3):	*pero sí, queremos hacerlo. yyy//no quiero empezar aa en la universidad al tiro, (A: ujum) porque quiero descansar *un año por lo menos*. yyy ademas, no sé lo que quiero estudiar.///* but sure, we want to do it, and// I don't want to start at the university at once, (A: uhum) because I want to take it easy *for a year at least* aaand besides I don't know what to study.///
26.	Alcira (7):	*y además es dificil.* and besides it's difficult.
27.	Natalia (6):	*-sí.* -yes.
28.	Alcira (8):	*-entrar por lo menos.* -to get admission at least.
29.	Natalia (7):	*-sí exacto. entonces mejor hay que subir sus notas en 'komvux'* -exactly. so it's better to improve your marks at 'komvux'[16]
30.	Alcira (9):	*-*ay. qué horrible.** -*ay, how awful.*
31.	Natalia (8):	-'oh my god?'
32.	Alcira (10)	*-así que en 'komvux' ahí como un año y medio (RISAS)* -so another one and a half year at 'komvux' (LAUGHTER)
33.	Natalia (9)	*-*sí*/// bueno, y después a la universidad,. aunque no sé.* -*yes*///well, and then the university, although I don't know.
34.	Alcira (11)	*-pero no sabes qué quieres hacer? o sea qué profesión.* -but you don't know what you want to do or what profession.
35.	Natalia (10)	*-no, no sé. Eso también lo quiero pensar *en un año* (RISAS)* -no, I don't know. I will have to think about it *for a year* (LAUGHTER)
36.	Alcira (12)	(RISAS) (LAUGHTER)

[EJBE4: A3. f 18; N4. f18] [17]

---

[15] The conversations have been translated preliminarily. See notations at the end.

[16] Komvux= adult education in Sweden.

[17] [EJBE 4: A3. f 18; N4. f18] within parenthesis: EJBE (Español Jóvenes Bilingües en Estocolmo [Spanish of Bilingual Youth in Stockholm]) followed of the number of the magnetic tape (4). A3, means (=) initial letter of the name of the first speaker fol-

Here twenty-three *interventions* (lines 14-36) and twenty-two *turns* can be distinguished; twelve turns from Alcira and ten from Natalia. The turn (3) from Natalia (line 19) is not completed until it manages to recover the lost thread and finish what it wished to communicate on line 25. This turn from Natalia makes a stop, first because of the *backchannelling intervention* by Alcira, in brackets (A: ah). I consider these elements to be *backchannelling* or *retroalimentary* (cf. Fant 1996) since I have noticed as I have been transcribing the dialogues, that they are pronounced almost without a pause and with a continuous intonation. They just touch the sender's message but do not signify that the receiver (receptor) demands a turn (that the receiver wants to intervene in the conversation). Natalia takes up the thread of what she wanted to say in line (25).

We have seen that a turn at talk can be made up of one or various *interventions*. The segmentation of speech into *utterances* and *idea units* is due to the objectives of the researcher. In example 1, above, the turn of Alcira (1) is in itself an utterance *What are you going to do when you finish school?*

The *idea units* are exemplified in example (2) (lines 25, 25a, 25b, and 25c). All these units are introduced by a DM (blackened in our example) for example in line 25, ***but** sure, we want to do it*, and in line 25a, ***aaand**// I don't want to start at the university at once*, and so on.

Example (2) (we reproduce a part of example 1)

25.	Natalia:	***pero sí**, queremos hacerlo,* **but** sure, we want to do it
25a.		*yyy/// no quiero empezar en la universidad al tiro, (A::ujum)* **aaand**// I don't want to start at the university at once (A:uhum)
25b.		***porque** quiero descansar un °año por lo menos°.* **because** I want to take it easy °for a year at least°.
25c.		*-yyy **ademas**, no sé lo que quiero estudiar.///* **-aaand besides** I don't know what to study.///

[EJBE4: A3. f18; N4. f18]

5 Characterisation and classification of the discourse markers

I have chosen the term *discourse marker* because of its overall general meaning and because: "there are discourse markers that don't connect or do so only occasionally"[18] (Portolés 1998: 35).

---

lowed by her number as informant, followed of the gender of the informant: f=femenino (feminine) m=masculino (masculine) and the age=18 years, after (;) repeated the dates for the second speaker: N4. f18.

[18] MT from Spanish, "[...] existen marcadores del discurso que no conectan o que lo hacen sólo en ocasiones "

Studies on the prototype of the *connector* in colloquial Spanish (Pons Bordería 1998) classify as real connectors the co-ordinating conjunctions, for example *and* and *but.*[19]

When using the expression, *discourse marker,* I refer to units of speech in use which fulfil the role of sequential organisation (Levinson 1983). Briz Gómez (1994;1998) correctly calls them *speech conjunctions* (conjunciones del habla) and in doing so he refers to their connecting capacity.

Portolés (1998: 25) says:

> Los *marcadores del discurso* son unidades lingüísticas invariables, no ejercen una función sintáctica en el marco de la predicación oracional y poseen un cometido coincidente en el discurso: el de guiar, de acuerdo con sus distintas propiedades morfosintácticas, semánticas y pragmáticas, las inferencias que se realizan en la comunicación.
>
> *Discourse markers* are invariable linguistic units, they do not perform a syntactic function within the frame of the predication statement and they possess the coinciding task in the discourse of guiding the inferences realised in communication, in accordance with morfo-syntactic, semantic and pragmatic qualities (MT).

I consequently use the expression, *discourse marker*,[20] stressing its overall meaning including connectors and other particles in this study.

In the following classification, these are, in grammatical terms the conjunctions, *y* (English *and*), *pero* (English *but*), *porque* (English *because*), *así que* (English *so*), the adverbs *entonces* (English *then*), *sí* (English *yes*), *ya* (English: *already, now, late, soon, well, right, alright* and many more), interjections, *bueno* (English *well*), the combination of adverbs and verbs like *no sé* (English *I don't know*) and an element that is not classified in the grammar *um.*

Connectors	**Conversational markers**
Y, pero, porque, entonces, así que	*Um, bueno, no sé, ya, sí*
And, but, because, then, so	Um, well, I don't know, *ya*[21] , yes

Table 2. Classification of the discourse markers in the study

The classification, in Table 2, of the DM follows approximately that of Martín Zorraquino and Portolés Lázaro in the *Gramática descriptiva de la Lengua española* (GDLE 1999: § 63.1.6) (*Descriptive Grammar of the Spanish Language*). A classification that stresses: "the role that

---

[19] The units that interest me have been studied by various people: Halliday and Hasan (1976) call them *internal conjunctions*, Fuentes Rodríguez (1987) in Spanish "enlaces conjuntivos" (or linking conjunctions); van Dijk (1979, 1993) *pragmatic connectives*; Schiffrin (1987) *discourse markers*. In the opinion of this writer (1987: 49) the discourse markers form a part of an analysis of the coherence of the discourse, that is "[...] how speakers and hearers jointly integrate forms, meanings, and actions to make overall sense out of what is said".

[20] The term *discourse marker* has been used in the studies of English by, among others, Schiffrin (1987); Fraser (1990), Jucker and Siv (1998). In Spanish, among others, by Brizuela (1992); Martín Zorraquino (1994a); Poblete (1996); Martín Zorraquino and Montolío Durán (1998); Martín Zorraquino and Portolés Lázaro (1999); Portolés (1993b, 1994, 1998).

[21] *Ya* has many translations in English: already, now, soon, well, right, alright etc.

the markers perform in the communication.[22,23] This classification includes five groups: *structurizers of information*, the *connectors*, the *reformulators*, the *argumentative operators* and the *conversational markers*. I extend this last group with the element *um* which according to the *Diccionario de uso de la lengua espanola*, by Maria Moliner (1996) is defined as a sound that indicates "uneasiness, hesitation or suspicion". By the use of this classification, we do not pretend to complicate things[24] but instead use it for guidance. And for sure, the young people that participate in this study, will by using these elements, bring out their potential nuances.

6 Frequency of use of the discourse markers in the dialogue

Here follows the presentation of the frequency of the use of the DM in the dialogues. The absolute frequency of the DM, calculated on the total of the words is 3% for the *connectors* (1 387/40 732) and 2% for *conversational markers* (839/ 40 732).

The frequent use of the connectors has been verified, for example, in Cepeda's studies (1999) of the speech of Valdivia in Chile.

Connectors			Conversational Markers		
	n	%		n	%
Y	568	25,5%	Um	322	14,4%
Pero	449	20,1%	Bueno	159	7,1%
Porque	165	7,4%	No sé	157	7,1%
Entonces	104	4,7%	Ya	104	4,7%
Así que	101	4,5%	Sí	97	4,4%
Total	1 387/2 226			839/2 226	

n=number of times of each of the DM (y, pero, porque etc)
%=percent of use of the variables in relation to the total number of DM. 2 226= total DM

Table 3. Variation in the use of the DM:

Table 3 shows the variation in the use of ten DM, the frequency of use in the total of the DM. This variation arranges the DM in an order of frequency which puts *y* (English *and*, with 26%) in first position, in second place *pero* (English *but*, with 20%) followed by the conversational

[22] According to Portolés (1999: § 63.1.2.1) "[…] la comunicación no constituye únicamente un proceso de codificación y descodificación de enunciados, sino también y muy principalmente, una labor de inferencia." ([…] the communication is not only a process of encoding and decoding utterances, but also, and first of all an inference work." M T). Portolés explains that this explanation of the communication process is grounded in the Relevance Theory of Sperber and Wilson (1986). He explains this in the following way: "Cuando alguien dice: *Tengo frío*,en una habitación con la ventana abierta, no sólo desea que el oyente entienda el enunciado, que lo descodifique, sino que concluya que quiere que se cierre la ventana". (" When someone says: *I'm cold*, in a room where the window is open, not only does he want the listener to understand the utterance, but also that the listener concludes that the speaker wants him to shut the window." M T). See also Wilson and Sperber (1993).

[23] MT from Spanish: "en el papel que los marcadores cumplen en la comunicación."

[24] "ponerle puertas al campo" (Martín Zorraquino 1999: § 63.1.1).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

marker *um* (English *mm*, with 14 %), then in third position, the connector *porque* (English *because*, with 7%) and the conversational markers *bueno* (English, *well*) and *no sé* (English *I don't know*) with 7%, in fifth place the connectors *entonces* (English *then*), *así que* (English *so*), and the conversational marker *ya* (see note 22.), all with 5%, and finally in sixth position the conversational marker *sí* (English *yes* with 4%.)

7 Distribution of discourse markers at the turn of talk

The DM appear in three positions. They initiate the turn at talk (IM), they mark the central part of the turn (CM) and they mark the end of the turn (TM). In example (3) *y además* (*and besides* in English) (line 26) is an IM, *yyy* (*and* in English), *porque* (*because* in English), and *yyy además* (*and besides* in English)(in the turn 3 from Natalia) mark the central part of the turn. In example (4) *entonces* (*then* in English) marks the end of the turn (in line 4).

Example (3) (I reproduce part of the example 1)

25.	Natalia (3):	*pero sí, queremos hacerlo. yyy///no quiero empezar aa en la universidad al tiro. (A: ujum)* ***porque*** *quiero descansar *un año por lo menos.* **yyy además** no sé lo que quiero estudiar.///* But sure, we want to do it, **aaand**//I don't want to start at the university at once, (A: hum) **because** I want to take it easy *for a year at least* **aaand besides** I don't know what to study.///
26.	Alcira (7):	***y además** es difícil.* And besides it's difficult.

(EJBE4: A3. f 18; N4. f18)

Example (4) Verónica and Carlos are talking about their weekend activities

1.	Verónica:	*y tú que hiciste*? and you, what did you do?
2.	Carlos:	*yo, um./ nada. me quedé en la casa (V: RISAS) es que sabes el teléfono* me, um/nothing. I stayed at home (V: LAUGHTER) the telephone
3.		*me quedó descolgado,/ entonces cuando me llamaron los amigos no me* had been disconnected,/ so when my friends called
4.		*pudieron/ hablar (V:ah) conmigo* ***entonces*** . they couldn't (V:ah) reach me **so.**

(EJBE1: V1. f 17; C2. m16)

DM	IM		CM		TM		Total DM
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
Y	143	**6,4%**	404	**18,1%**	21	0,9%	568
Pero	131	**5,9%**	291	**13,1%**	27	1,2%	449
Um	233	**10,4%**	59	2,7%	30	1,3%	322
Porque	15	0,7%	147	**6,6%**	3	0,1%	165
Bueno	43	1,9%	111	**4,9%**	5	0,2%	159
No sé	36	1,6%	110	**4,9%**	11	0,5%	157
Entonces	20	0,9%	77	**3,5%**	7	0,3%	104
Yá	69	**3,1%**	28	1,3%	7	0,3%	104
Así que	30	1,3%	66	2,9%	5	0,2%	101
Si	77	**3,5%**	12	0,5%	8	0,4%	97
Total	797	**35,8%**	1 305	**58,6%**	124	**5,6%**	**2 226**

DM=discourse markers; IM=initial markers; CM=corpus markers and TM=terminal markers.
n=number of times of each of the DM (y, pero, porque etc)
%=percent of use of the variables in relation to the total number of DM in each position (IM: 797;CM: 1 305 and TM: 124).
*The total percentage for each position in the total of DM (*2 226)

Table 4. Distribution of the DM in the turn at talk

The distribution of the DM at *turns of talk* as we see in the Table 4 shows a certain profile concerning their position. The percentage of each group is based on the total of the discourse markers. Those indicating the central part of the turn (CM) have a major frequency of use (59%) and contribute in this way to the progression of the conversation. In second place we have the initial markers (IM) (36%) whose conversational role according to Briz (1994: 386) is that of being markers: "of reinforcement of dialogical initiative or reactive connector of two acts or interventions in the"[25] dialogue. Lastly we have those markers that mark the final (TM) (6%).

Some DM stand out in these positions. In the initial marker position (MI), *um* (*mm*, 10%), *y* and *pero* (*and*, *but*, 6%), *ya* and *sí* (see note 21 for *ya*, *yes*, 3%) stand out. In the central position (CM) *y* (*and*, 18%) stands out followed by *pero* (*but*, 13%), *porque* (*because*, 7%), *bueno* (*okay*, 5%), *no sé* (*I don't know*, 5%), *entonces* (*so/consequently*, 3%). In final position (TM) the percentages are lower (about 1% or less).

8 Discussion

Both in the analysis of discourse (Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975 *inter alia*) and in the analysis of conversation (Sacks *et al.* 1974, *inter alia*) have interested themselves in dialogical data (Gallardo, 1996). Both directions have common points of interest (Moeschler, 1999: 517-541). They

[25] MT from Spanish: " refuerzo de un acto dialógico iniciativo o reactivo conector ahora de dos actos o intervenciones en el "[...] of reinforcement of dialogical initiative or reactive connector of two acts or interventions on the" dialogue.

take an interest in (i) face to face interaction, (ii) and the sequential organisation of the conversations and the principles that guaranty their coherence and also in (iii) the relations between the sequence of acts that make up the conversation (Searle, 1994) or in the actions realised preferentially by the speakers.

In an effort to handle the analysis of the dialogue the study has established the position of the DM at the *turn of talk*. This has given us an overall view of their position. The frequency of use of these signs in the three positions confirms the hypothesis that the DM are located preferentially inside the turn at talk. Nevertheless, this (that is the *turn at talk*) could be composed by *utterances* or *idea units* preceded by the DM, as shows in example (2). Thus we think that the analysis of the DM at the level of these units is necessary.

It seems that there is no agreement when it comes to defining the notions the study has dealt with here. For example, when the definition of the *utterance* is concerned, it is best to avoid it.

Faced with this lack of determination and different tendencies in the analysis of the conversations, I have made my position clear in this respect. The study's approach to this analysis of the dialogue emphasises its characteristics as discursive interaction.

The criteria of frequency of use of the discourse markers have enabled me to make a selection of these. A necessary delimitation which is based on the highest frequency. Those that stand out as frequently used among the young informants have been mentioned for their frequent use in other studies (Brizuela, 1992; Poblete 1996; Cepeda, 1999 *inter alia* in Spanish; Schiffrin, 1987 in English).

9 Conclusions

In our study, certain uses of the discourse markers stand out; those are in particular:

1. The *connectors* have a more frequent use in comparison with the *conversational markers*.
2. The most frequently used *connectors* are *y* (English *and*), *pero* (English *but*), *porque* (English *because*), *entonces* (English *then*) and *así que* (English *so/consequently*).
3. The most frequently used *conversational markers* are *um, bueno* (English *mm, well*), *no sé* (English *I don't know*), *ya* (see note 22) and *sí* (English *yes*).
4. The *discourse markers* are located at the *turn of talk*, first as CM (at a central position), secondly as IM (initial markers) and finally as TM (end markers) at a reduced percentage.
5. The most frequently used DM as CM (central markers) are *y* (English *and*), *pero* (English *but*), *porque* (English *because*), as IM (initial markers) *um, y* (English *mm, and*) and *pero* (English *but*), and as TM (end markers) at low frequencies *um, pero* (English *mm, but*) and *y* (English *and*).

The conversations have been translated preliminarily. We intend to follow the following notations:

/	noticeable pause less to a half second
//	pause between a half second an a second
///	pause more than a second
(LAUGHTER)	when they appear at the limits of an utterance
* *	something that says laughing
[	beginning of the place of overlap
]	end of the pace of overlap
-	turns at talk follows without interruption
,	continuing intonation
?	rising intonation
.	falling intonation
h	aspiration of «s»
aaa	lengthened syllable
' '	words and expressions in other languages than Spanish
(( ))	incomprenssible
VAMOS	very emphatic stress
o o	very low stress
bold type	is used to highlight those discourse markers being discussed in the text

References

Bravo Cladera, N. (1995): *Conectores semánticos y conectores pragmáticos. Un estudio de los textos escritos y orales en el español de alumnos bilingües.* Master of Arts thesis, Department of Spanish and Portuguese, Stockholm University.

Bravo Cladera, N. (1997): «Conectores semánticos y pragmáticos». *Moderna* Språk, 2, 218-228.

Bravo Cladera, N. (1999a): «Conectores semánticos y conectores pragmáticos. Un estudio contrastivo de los textos en el español de niños bilingües y unilingües». In J. A. Samper, M. Troya *et al.* (eds.), *XI Congreso Internacional de la Asociación de Lingüística y Filología de la América Latina*, Las Palmas de Gran Canaria 22-27 julio 1996 [XI International Congress of ALFAL, Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, 22–27 July 1996], Las Palmas de Gran Canaria: Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria and Librería Nogal (3 vol.), vol. 2, 1419-1435.

Bravo Cladera, N. (1999c): «Aproximaciones al estudio de los conectores». In J. Nystedt, (ed.), *XIV Skandinaviska Romanistkongressen,* Stockholm, 10-15 augusti 1999 [XIV Congress of Skandinavien Romanists, 10-15 augusti 1999], CD-ROM, Stockholm, Almqvist & Wiksell.

Bravo Cladera, N. (forthcoming): «Un estudio de los marcadores del discurso y su distribución en interacciones diádicas de jóvenes bilingües». In proceedings from the *XXIII Congreso Internacional de Filología y Lingüística Románicas*, Salamanca, 24–30 de septiembre 2001 [XXIII International Congress of Romanic Philology and Linguistics, Salamanca, 24–30 september 2001].

Briz Gómez, A. (1994): «Hacia un análisis de un texto coloquial. La incidencia de los conectores pragmáticos». *Verba,* 21, 369-395.

Briz Gómez, A. (1998): *El español coloquial en la conversación. Esbozo de pragmagramática.* Barcelona, Ariel Lingüística.

Brizuela, M.C. (1992): «Marcadores discursivos en narrativas de niños bilingües». In H. Urrutia Cárdenas & C. Silva-Corvalán (eds.), *Bilingüismo y adquisición del español: estudios en España y EE.UU.,* Bilbao, Editorial/Educacional, 333-352.

Cepeda, G. (1999): «La variación pragmático-discursiva, entonacional y sociolingüística de los conectores conjuntivos en el habla de Valdivia, Chile». In M.J. Serrano (ed.), *Estudios de variación sintáctica*, Madrid, Iberoamericana,103-120.

Chafe, W. (1980): «The development of consciousness in the production of a narrative». In W. Chafe (ed.), *The Pear Stories: Cognitive, cultural, and linguistic aspects of narrative production,* Norwood, N.J: Ablex, 9-50.

van Dijk, T. A. (1979): «Pragmatic connectives». *Journal of Pragmatics*, 3, 447-456.

van Dijk, T. A. (1993:1976): *Texto y contexto.* Madrid, Cátedra.

Fant, L. (1996): «Regulación conversacional en la negociación: una comparación entre pautas mexicanas y peninsulares ». In T. Kotschi, W. Oesterreicher y K. Zimmermann (eds.), *El español hablado y la cultura oral en España e Hispanoamérica*, Madrid, Iberoamericana, 147-177.

Fant, L., K. Hyltenstam *et al.* (1999): SPISS projekt (Språk och Identitetsutveckling hos spansktalande med bosättning i Sverige)[Language and identity development of Spanish speaking with residence in Sweden]. Department of Spanish and Portuguese, Centre for Research on Bilingualism, Stockholm University.

Fraser, B. (1990): «An approach to discourse markers». *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14, 383-395.

Fuentes Rodríguez, C. (1987): *Enlaces extraoracionales.* Sevilla, Alfar.

Gallardo Pauls, B. (1996): *Análisis conversacional y pragmática del receptor.* Valencia, Ediciones Episteme.

Halliday, MAK. (1967): «Notes on transitivity and theme in English». II, *Journal of Linguistics*, 3, 199-244.

Halliday, M.A.K. and R. Hasan (1976): *Cohesion in English*. London, Longman.

Jucker, A.H. and J. Ziv (1998): «Discourse markers: Introduction». In Jucker, A.H. and J. Ziv (eds.), *Discourse Markers. Descriptions and theory*, Amsterdam/ Philadelphia, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1-12.

Labov, W. (1972a): *Language in the inner city: studies in the black English vernacular*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.

Levinson, S.C. (1983): *Pragmatics*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Linell. P. (1998): *Approaching dialogue. Talk, interaction and contexts in dialogical perspectives*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Loman, B. and N. Jörgensen (1972): *Manual för analys och beskrivning av macrosyntagmer*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Martín Zorraquino, M.A. (1994a): «Gramática del discurso. Los llamados marcadores del discurso». In *Actas del Congreso de la Lengua Española, Sevilla, 1992*, Madrid, Instituto Cervantes, 709-720.

Martín Zorraquino, M.A. and E. Montolío Durán (eds.) (1998): *Los marcadores del discurso. Teoría y análisis*. Madrid, Arco/Libros.

Martín Zorraquino, M.A. and J. Portolés Lázaro (1999): «Los marcadores del discurso». In I. Bosque y V. Demonte (eds.), *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, vol. 3, Madrid, Espasa Calpe, 4051-4203.

Moeschler, J. (1999:1994): «Análisis del discurso y análisis conversacional». In J. Moeschler and A. Reboul (eds.), *Diccionario enciclopédico de pragmática*, Madrid, Arrecife, 517-541.

Moliner, M. (1996): *Diccionario de uso del español*. Edición en CD-ROM, versión 1.1., Madrid, Gredos.

Poblete, M.T. (1996): «El rol de los marcadores discursivos en el intercambio conversacional». *Revista de lingüística teórica y aplicada*, Universidad de Concepción, Chile, 34,167- 181.

Pons Bordería, S. (1998): *Conexión y conectores. Estudio de su relación en el registro informal de la lengua*. Anejo XXVII de la revista *Cuadernos de Filología*, University of Valencia.

Portolés, J. (1993b): «La distinción entre los conectores y otros marcadores del discurso en español». *Verba*, 20, 141-170.

Portolés, J. (1994): «Pertinencia y pragmática». *Revista de Occidente*, 154, 55-66.

Portolés, J. (1998): *Marcadores del discurso*. Barcelona, Ariel.

Reyes, G. (1995): *El abecé de la pragmática*. Madrid, Arco/Libros.

Sacks, H., E. Schegloff and G. Jefferson (1974): «A simplest systematics for the organisation of turn-taking in conversation». *Language*, 50, 167-181.

Searle, J. (1994[4] 1986): Actos de Habla. Ensayo-de filosofía del lenguaje. Madrid, Cátedra .

Schiffrin, D. (1987): *Discourse markers*. Cambridge University Press.

Schiffrin, D. (1994): *Approaches to Discourse*. Cambridge/Oxford, Blackwell.

Sinclair, A. and R.M. Coulthard (1975): *Towards an Analysis of Discourse*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

SIV, Statens Invandrarverk. (1997): *Statistik. Invandrare i Sverige*. SIVs planeringsavdelning.

Soskin, W, and V. John (1963): «The study of spontaneous talk». In R. Barker (ed.), *The Stream of Behavior*, New York, Appleton-Century Crafts, 228-287.

Sperber, D. and D. Wilson (1994:1986): *La Relevancia*. Madrid, Visor.

Tusón Valls, A. (1997): *Análisis de la conversación*. Barcelona, Ariel Practicum.

Wilson, D. and D. Sperber (1993): «Linguistic form and relevance». *Lingua*, 90, 1-25.

ED 021 348

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: "A study of discourse Markers and their Distribution in Dyadic Interactions of Bilingual Youth"	
Author(s): Nadezhda BRAVO CLADERA	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date: 24 February 2003

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☒

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Nadezhda Bravo Cladera	Printed Name/Position/Title: FM, Lic-ès-lettres de Linguistique. Nadezhda BRAVO CLADERA
Organization/Address: Uppsala University, Romanska institutionen	Telephone: +46 18 471 2525 / FAX: +46 18 471 1630
Box 527 SE-751 50 Uppsala	E-Mail Address: Nadezhda.Bravo-Cladera@romanska.uu.se / Date: 24/2-2003

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC Clearinghouse on
Languages & Linguistics
4646 40TH St. NW
Washington, D.C. 20016-1859

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2000)